

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-27 and 29-30 are pending, of which claims 1, 10, 21 and 27 are independent. By this amendment, claims 10-11, 17 and 21-27 are amended and claim 28 is canceled.

In numbered paragraph 1 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 8 and 10-20 stand objected to for informalities. Regarding claim 8, the phrase "a network switch" remains since this is the first recitation of the network switch. Regarding claim 10, the word "memory" in line 3 is modified to read "a memory" as the Examiner suggests. Regarding the word "information" in line 7, this is not the same information as the information stored in the memory in line 4. Regardless, to enhance clarity, claim 10 is amended to read "data" stored in the memory for differentiation purposes. Claim 11 is amended to be consistent with the amendments to claim 10. Claim 17 is amended as the Examiner suggests. None of the foregoing amendments alter the scope of the claims but rather are intended to clarify the language already present. Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claims 8 and 10-20 be withdrawn.

In numbered paragraph 3 on pages 2-3 of the Office Action, claims 1-30 are rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter and which applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner asserts that the phrase "all devices" in independent claims 1, 10, 21 and 27 is confusing as only a first device has been previously recited. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 recites "determining whether a first device is included in a portion of a network in which the first device can receive information directed to all devices included within the portion of the network." Claims 10, 21 and 27 recite similar

features. One of ordinary skill would appreciate that one or more devices can be included within a portion of a network and that a device (e.g. a first device) can receive information directed to all devices within the portion of the network. The claims do particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-30 based on 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

In numbered paragraph 5 on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Regarding claims 21-26, the claims are amended to read "a computer readable storage medium" to address this issue. Again, the amendments do not alter the scope of the claims but are submitted only to clarify the language already present.

Regarding claims 27-30, Applicants respectfully traverse. As featured in claim 27, a first identifier is associated with a portion of a network. Thus, the first identifier is useful, concrete and tangible since the network is useful, concrete and tangible. Similarly, a second identifier is also associated with the portion of the network unique to other portions of the network. Thus, the second identifier is also useful, concrete and tangible. Finally, associating the first and second identifiers with the device and the portion of the network is a useful, concrete and tangible result. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 21-30 based on § 101 be withdrawn.

In numbered paragraph 7 on pages 4-8 of the Office Action, independent claims 1, 10, 21 and 27 along with dependent claims 2-5, 8-9, 11, 13, 14, 17-21, 22-24 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Green (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0213211). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants have disclosed a method and system for resolving network connectivity. As exemplified in Figures 1-3, a determination is made whether a first device is included in a portion of a network in which the first device can receive information directed to all devices included within the portion of the network. A first identifier associated with the portion of the network is obtained, and a second identifier is assigned to the portion of the network unique to other portions of the network. The first identifier associated with the portion of the network is modified to include the second identifier. The modified first identifier is associated with the first device and the portion of the network.

The foregoing features are broadly encompassed by independent claim 1 which recites "[a] method for resolving network connectivity, the method comprising: determining whether a first device is included in a portion of a network in which the first device can receive information directed to all devices included within the portion of the network; obtaining a first identifier associated with the portion of the network; assigning a second identifier to the portion of the network unique to other portions of the network; modifying the first identifier associated with the portion of the network to include the second identifier; and associating the modified first identifier with the first device and the portion of the network." The Green publication does not disclose, among other features, the feature of modifying the first identifier associated with the portion of the network to include the second identifier.

The Green publication discloses a method to determine shared broadcast domains of a network based on learned features about ports or interfaces of the devices of the network. In the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that the MAC address of a device is equivalent to the first identifier as recited. One of ordinary skill will appreciate that the MAC address is universally specific to each device, and thus

would not be modified, which is contrary to the Examiner's assertion. The MAC-to-Broadcast domain table shown in paragraph [0034] illustrates that the MAC addresses are not modified. Other elements such as the Device ID, Port, VLAN ID and VLAN Name are merely read from address forwarding tables and sorted. They are not modified. *See paragraphs [0028]-[0034]*. The Green publication does not disclose the feature of modifying the first identifier associated with the portion of the network to include the second identifier. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the Green publication.

Independent claims 10, 21 and 27 recite similar features. Accordingly, these independent claims are allowable over the Green publication. Dependent claims 2-5, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 17-20, 22-24 and 29-30 depend from independent claims 1, 10, 21 and 27. Accordingly, these dependent claims are allowable over the Green publication. It should be noted that claim 27 is amended to include the features of claim 28. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-14, 17-24 and 27-30 based on the Green publication be withdrawn.

In numbered paragraph 9 on pages 8-10 of the Office Action, claims 6-7, 15-16 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Green publication in view of Shamir et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,269,076). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 6-7, 15-16 and 25-26 depend from independent claims 1, 10 and 21, respectively, and these independent claims are allowable over the Green publication. The Shamir patent does not cure the deficiencies of the Green publication. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 10 and 21 and the dependent claims 6-7, 15-16 and 25-26 are allowable over the combination of the Green publication and the

Shamir patent. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 6-7, 15-16 and 25-26 based on the Green publication and the Shamir patent be withdrawn.

In numbered paragraph 10 on pages 9-10 of the Office Action, claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Green publication in view of Lewis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,442). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 12 depends from independent claim 10 and claim 10 is allowable over the Green publication. The Lewis patent does not cure the deficiencies of the Green publication. Accordingly, claim 10 and the dependent claim 12, which recites further distinguishing features, are allowable over the combination of the Green publication and the Lewis patent. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 12 based on the Green publication and the Lewis patent be withdrawn.

All rejections and objections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: July 20, 2007

By: 

Patrick C. Keane
Registration No. 32858

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620